



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,653	11/30/2000	Fabrice Bancetl	Q61879	5626
23373	7590	06/16/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/701,653	Applicant(s) BANCTEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Haresh Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/20/2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-9 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "the cited reference, i.e., Menzies et al., 6,317,748, Microsoft (Hereinafter Menzies-Microsoft) does not disclose or suggest the claimed central directory as set forth in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Besides, teachings of what program modules can be stored on, what a user may use to enter commands, and what type of device can be used to display information., col., 4, lines 51-64, Menzies-Microsoft also discloses the claimed central directory (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "cited reference, i.e., Menzies-Microsoft does not disclose or suggest claimed father object, son object, same process and assigning to a father object in a

Art Unit: 2154

process, for each of one son object, information corresponding to a physical address if said one son object is contained in a same process. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Besides, teachings of how a particular tree is traversed, col., 15, lines 36-54, Menzies-Microsoft also discloses the claimed father object (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54), son object (e.g. col., 16, lines 4 – 36), same process (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54) and assigning to a father object (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54) in a process (e.g., e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54), for each of one son object, information (e.g., col., 13, lines 48 – 64) corresponding to a physical address (e.g., col., 14, lines 33 – 54) if said one son object is contained in a same process (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), “the cited reference, i.e., Menzies-Microsoft does not disclose or suggest a central directory receiving a request directory, nor a central directory searching its data structure directory for the logical name received in order to send the request directly to a first object and a father object which receives the request sends the request to the first object if returns a message to the central directory. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Besides, teachings of the addressing of objects within an object path, col., 10, lines 14-58, Menzies-Microsoft also discloses a central directory receiving a request (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository

Art Unit: 2154

of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30), a central directory searching its data structure (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30) for the logical name received (e.g., col., 10, lines 38 – 67) in order to send the request directly to a first object (e.g., col., 15, lines 8 – 29, col., 10, lines 38 – 67), and a father object which receives the request sends the request to the first object if returns a message to the central directory (e.g., figure 8, col., 17, lines 4 – 35). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (4), “the cited reference Skog et al., Ericsson, 6,385,650 (Hereinafter Skog-Ericsson) fails to teach or suggest identifying a central directory and managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, “identifying a central directory and managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object”, are rejected by combined teachings of Menzies-Microsoft and Skog et al., Ericsson, 6,385,650 (Hereinafter Skog-Ericsson). Menzies-Microsoft discloses identifying a central directory (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64,

Art Unit: 2154

col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30). Skog-Ericsson teaches the well-known concept of managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object (e.g., figure 6, col., 3, line 40 – col., 4, line 23). Hence, the combined teachings of the cited arts disclose the claimed limitations, “identifying a central directory and managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object”. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (5), “the cited reference Collins et al., 6,687,761, Invensys Systems (Hereinafter Collins-Invensys) fails to teach or suggest if a father object of a process receives a request relating to a son object directly, it returns that request to the directory if the son object is not contained in its process”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Menzies-Microsoft discloses identifying a central directory (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30). Collins-Invensys teaches the well-known concept of if a father object of a process receives a request relating to a son object directly, it returns that request to the directory if the son object is not contained in its process (e.g., col., 9, lines 18 – 38,

Art Unit: 2154

col., 17, line 52 – col., 18, line 15, figures 1 and 2). Hence, the combined teachings of the cited arts disclose the claimed limitations, “a central directory and if a father object of a process receives a request relating to a son object directly, it returns that request to the directory if the son object is not contained in its process”. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (6), “there is no motivation to combine the teachings of cited references, i.e., Menzies-Microsoft and Collins-Invensys”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to the references containing a suggestion, or motivation to modify or to combine with each other, it is well established that a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references based on a reason, suggestion or motivation to lead an inventor to combine those references. *In re Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastic Inc.*, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Menzies-Microsoft discloses identifying a central directory (e.g., at

Art Unit: 2154

several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30). Collins-Invensys teaches the well-known concept of if the father object of a the process receives a request relating to the son object directly, said father object returns that request to the directory (e.g., col., 9, lines 18 – 38, col., 17, line 52 – col., 18, line 15, figures 1 and 2). The father object would return the request, which it does not belong to the son object. The returned request would be sent to the directory, which would handle the returned request. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (7), “the cited reference Fiszman et al., Nortel Networks, 6,115,646 (Hereinafter Fiszman-Nortel) fails to teach or suggest the central directory contains at least information relating each root object of each process”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, “the central directory contains at least information relating each root object of each process”, are rejected by combined teachings of Menzies-Microsoft and Fiszman-Nortel. Menzies-Microsoft discloses identifying a central directory (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30). Fiszman-Nortel teaches the well-known concept of directory containing information relating to each root object of each process and a manager of a CORBA type (e.g., col., 6, lines 11 – 64, figure 17). Hence, the combined teachings of the cited arts disclose the claimed limitations, “the central directory contains at least information relating each root object of each process”. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

Art Unit: 2154

claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 9 are attempting to implement a method of implementing a tree of distributed objects in different processes (preamble), however the implemented method (steps) do not transform physical subject matter (tangible) to a different state or thing. Note: The applicant's assertion that the claimed invention steps (not preamble) implement a concrete and tangible result, i.e., "a tree of distributed objects in different processes is implemented and problems of redundancy at the central directory level can be managed", is incorrect. The claimed invention steps, i.e., "information corresponding to a physical address if at least one of said each of said at least two son objects is contained in a same process and information referring back to said central directory if another at least one of said each of said at least two son objects is not contained in the same process", see claim 1, does not contain distributed objects, different

Art Unit: 2154

processes, etc, does not implement concrete and tangible result, and does not solve problems of redundancy at the central directory level can be managed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-3, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Menzies et al., 6,317,748, Microsoft (Hereinafter Menzies-Microsoft) in view of "Official Notice".

6. As per claim 1, Menzies-Microsoft teaches a method of implementing a tree (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 64, figure 8) of distributed objects (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 18) in different processes (e.g., col., 5, lines 28 – 59), wherein a central directory (e.g., at several places, col., 3, lines 27 – 35, col., 4, lines 51 – 64, col., 1, lines 15 – 25, also usage of repository of figure 3, usage of registry and/or directory and/or repository of figure 4, col., 6, lines 31 – 34, col., 7, lines 54 – 59, col., 10, lines 27 - 30) is adapted to store information on objects (e.g., col., 10, lines 9 – 34) in a data structure (e.g., col., 10, lines 27 – 57) at a root of the tree (e.g., col., 10, lines 15 – 35) the method comprising:

assigning to a father object (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54) in a process (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54), for each of son object (e.g. col., 16, lines 4 – 36):

Art Unit: 2154

information (e.g., col., 13, lines 48 – 64) corresponding to a physical address (e.g., col., 14, lines 33 – 54) if the son object (at least one) is contained in a same process (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54) and information referring back to said central directory if another (the) son object (at least one) is not contained in the same process (e.g. col., 15, lines 36 – 54, col., 16, lines 4 – 36, col., 4, lines 5 - 48).

However, Menzies-Microsoft does not specifically mention about two son objects.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing two son objects is well known and expected in the art. For example, Whitney et al., 5,842,214 discloses usage of objects to form a sub-tree of the distributed structure. Volk et al., 5,673,401 discloses usage of hierarchical tree of objects that is distributed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include two son objects with the teachings of Menzies-Microsoft in order to facilitate usage of the two son objects because it would provide information related to the two son objects. The objects would support information for handling the process.

7. As per claim 2, Menzies-Microsoft also teaches wherein if the central directory receives a request (e.g., col., 5, lines 28 – 54) for access to a first object identified by a logical name (e.g., col., 10, lines 14 – 58, col., 15, lines 2 - 24) identifying a logical access path (e.g., col., 5, lines 28 – 54) of said first object from the central directory (e.g., col., 9, lines 26 – 44), the central directory searches its data structure for a logical name received (e.g., col., 10, lines 38 – 67) in order to send the request directly to said first object (e.g., col., 15, lines 8 – 29) and if said logical

Art Unit: 2154

name is not in the central directory, the central directory searches (e.g., col., 9, lines 26 – 44, col., 10, lines 38 – 67), for a logical name with a longest character string equal to a first part of the character string of the logical name received (e.g., col., 9, lines 26 – 44, col., 10, lines 38 – 67), in order to send to said father object the second character string corresponding to a logical name of said father object defining a second logical access path from the central directory (e.g., col., 9, lines 26 – 44, col., 10, lines 38 – 67).

8. As per claim 3, Menzies-Microsoft also teaches wherein said father object which receives said request sends the request to said first object if returns a message to the central directory (e.g., figure 8, col., 17, lines 4 – 35).

9. As per claim 9, Menzies-Microsoft also teaches wherein the method applies to a distributed object environment based on a manager of a DCOM type (e.g., col., 5, line 62 – col., 6, line 29).

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menzies-Microsoft and “Official Notice” in view of Skog et al., Ericsson, 6,385,650 (Hereinafter Skog-Ericsson).

11. As per claim 4, Menzies-Microsoft teaches the claimed limitations rejected as discloses above. However, Menzies-Microsoft does not specifically mention about managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object.

Skog-Ericsson teaches the well-known concept of managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object (e.g., figure 6, col., 3, line 40 – col., 4, line 23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Menzies-Microsoft with the teachings of Skog-Ericsson in order to facilitate managing redundancy of processes by selecting one of the processes relating to a requested object because the selected process would enhance handling the requested object. The software would help utilize the selected process in order to support the requested object using the central directory.

12. Claims 5 and 6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menzies-Microsoft and Official Notice in view of Collins et al., 6,687,761, Invensys Systems (Hereinafter Collins-Invensys) and “Official Notice”.

13. As per claims 5 and 6, Menzies-Microsoft teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Menzies-Microsoft also teaches wherein the son object (e.g. col., 16, lines 4 – 36) is identified in said request by a logical name (e.g., col., 10, lines 14 – 58, col., 15, lines 2 - 24) defining a first logical access path (e.g., col., 5, lines 28 – 54) of said object from father object (e.g., col., 15, lines 36 – 54) wherein said father object returns said request to the central directory with a first character string of said logical name preceded by a second character string (e.g., col., 10, lines 14 – 58, col., 15, lines 2 - 24) corresponding to a logical name of said father object defining a second logical access path from the central directory (e.g., col., 5, lines 28 – 54, col., 9, lines 26 – 44).

Art Unit: 2154

However, Menzies-Microsoft does not specifically mention about if the father object of a the process receives a request relating to the son object directly, said father object returns that request to the directory.

Collins-Invensys teaches the well-known concept of if the father object of the process receives a request relating to the son object directly, said father object returns that request to the directory (e.g., col., 9, lines 18 – 38, col., 17, line 52 – col., 18, line 15, figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Menzies-Microsoft with the teachings of Collins-Invensys in order to facilitate if the father object of the process receives a request relating to the son object directly, said father object returns that request to the directory because the father object would return the request which it does not belong to the son object. The returned request would be sent to the directory, which would handle the returned request.

Menzies-Microsoft and Collins-Invensys do not specifically mention about whether the son object is contained or not in the process of the father object. “Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing whether the son object is contained or not in the process of the father object is well known and expected in the art. For example, Hudis et al., 6,862,736, discloses these limitations, e.g., paragraphs 9 and 24.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include whether the son object is contained or not in the process of the father object with the teachings of Menzies-Microsoft and Collins-Invensys in order to determining whether son object is contained or not in the process of the father object because the determination would

Art Unit: 2154

inform the software about the inheritance related information: The software would process the information according to the determination.

14. Claims 7 and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menzies-Microsoft and Official Notice in view of Fiszman et al., Nortel Networks, 6,115,646 (Hereinafter Fiszman-Nortel).

15. As per claims 7 and 8, Fiszman-Nortel teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Menzies-Microsoft does not specifically mention about directory containing information relating to each root object of each process and a manager of a CORBA type.

Fiszman-Nortel teaches the well-known concept of directory containing information relating to each root object of each process and a manager of a CORBA type (e.g., col., 6, lines 11 – 64, figure 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Menzies-Microsoft with the teachings of Fiszman-Nortel in order to facilitate directory containing information relating to each root object of each process and a manager of the CORBA type because the directory would help handle each root object. The software would help utilize each process to handle each root object. The manager of the CORBA type would help utilize several different resources by the software.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2154

The applicant specifies the invention of the application, i.e., the summary of the invention, “The invention uses a central directory which contains tree information on only certain targeted objects, and so all the objects of a process can be accessed. A father object receives a location request in respect of a son object. The tree of processes is managed by the central directory. Providing access to objects of son processes even if a father process is stopped”, page 3, line 26 – page 4, line 8, seems. However, the claimed subject matter of the claims is very broad and not limited to this. Also, a data structure is not part of a central directory and the central directory not containing information on objects. A father object is in a process different than of a process in which a son object is contained (see claim 1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/701,653

Page 16

Art Unit: 2154

Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

June 10, 2006